

**Appl. No. 10/027,309
Amdt. dated March 11, 2005
Reply to final Office action of January 11, 2005**

REMARKS

Applicant received the final Office Action dated January 11, 2005, in which the Examiner: (1) rejected claims 1-21, 23-31, 33-39 and 41-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaudhuri et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,529,901, hereinafter "Chaudhuri") in view of Beavin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,272,487, hereinafter "Beavin"); (2) allowed claim 32; and (3) objected claims 22 and 40 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but otherwise allowable. In this Response, Applicant amends claims 21, 33, 35-37 and 41 and cancels claims 1-20, 22, 31, 40, and 42. Based on the amendments contained herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

I. CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claim 21 was amended to include the limitations of claim 22, which the Examiner stated was allowable in independent form. For at least this reason, Applicant submits that claim 21 and all claims that depend from claim 21 are allowable.

Claim 37 was amended to include the limitations of claim 40, which the Examiner stated was allowable in independent form. For at least this reason, Applicant submits that claim 37 and all claims that depend from claim 37 are allowable.

Amended claim 41 requires "determining a join selectivity for two columns based on a first selectivity value that assumes the two columns are dependent, a second selectivity value that assumes the two columns are independent and, when an interdependence of the two columns is unknown, an intermediate value between the first selectivity value and the second selectivity value." Neither Chaudhuri nor Beavin teaches or suggests these limitations. Also, the Examiner stated that claim 40, which required similar limitations was allowable in independent form. For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 41 and all claims that depend from claim 41 are allowable.

II. CONCLUSIONS

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicant may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a

Appl. No. 10/027,309
Amdt. dated March 11, 2005
Reply to final Office action of January 11, 2005

particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If any fees or time extensions are inadvertently omitted or if any fees have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Hewlett-Packard Company Deposit Account Number 08-2025 and enter any time extension(s) necessary to prevent this case from being abandoned.

Respectfully submitted,



Alan D. Christenson
PTO Reg. No. 54,036
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
AGENT FOR APPLICANT

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400